FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, January 29, 2014
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC

Members Present: Boller, H.; Classen, T.; Fine, J.; Friend, P.; Graham, D.; Jay, W.; Kelly, B.; Lash, N.; Lieblich, J.; Miller, H.; Ramsey, G.; Rose, H.; Ruppman, T.; Ryan, J.; Shoenberger, A.; Shanahan, A.; Smart, J.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:14pm by Gordon Ramsey. Invocation – Janis Fine.

2. Approval of December minutes. Moved: Jay; Boller seconded. Motion passed 11-0-1.

3. Chair's Report

   o I have had a good discussion with Dean Linda Brubaker about governance, HSD-FC relations, and other issues.

     ▪ The old SSOM Medical Council has been dissolved. In its place there is a new "faculty ambassador" system, with a ratio of 20 faculty per ambassador, to whom faculty can talk as liaisons with the administration. (The faculty ambassadors should meet with Faculty Council members as well; the idea is that not all issues need go to FC: most can be handled at SSOM). George Battaglia wishes to discuss more issues about this counsel; he will forward his concerns (could not attend today).

     ▪ HSD can set up a video conference room (about six months from now, costing about $50,000, according to Susan Malisch.) Finally teleconferencing may happen from Maywood.

     ▪ The new committees of Faculty Council are hard at work, thanks to those working on them. NL: All deans' evaluation committees have been set up and are awaiting survey results to begin the work on their reports. Jack Corliss of IT is handling the survey instrument. A small number of faculty failed to receive ballots; I've passed on the names of those who have contacted me about this to Jack. TR: this Friday or Monday I will send out the call for nominations for the next election to faculty Council. AS: the Faculty Affairs committee is working on the Handbook. We are particularly concerned with the issues around conversions of tenure-track to non-tenure-track lines.

     ▪ I have been asked by the Executive Committee to have Provost Pelissero post salary data for faculty (as used to occur years ago) on the academic affairs website. I will pass on the request to him.

- I've heard from several faculty members with paid parking that there have been some issues in the parking building at LSC. Apparently there has been overcrowding of the building due to increased usage during the recent bad weather. Faculty should be aware that the Granada Center parking garage is also available for paid parking.

4. SSOM/HSD: No report.

5. University Senate report (TC)
   o There has been no meeting of the US since the last FC meeting in December. However, six members of the task force the FAS met on 1/17 and 1/24 for a total of about six hours and made changes in the FAS document on the basis of US and FC input. It will be sent to John Pelissero on Saturday.

6. Feedback on student IDEA survey
   o Concerns discussed:
      1. GR: according to some reports to me, some departments were allowed to set questions, some not. Response rates varied; according to the Modern Languages and Literatures representative in many cases there was a very small response rate.
      2. Students reported that the IDEA survey had too many questions, and too much redundancy.
      3. GR: the handling of some of the numerical data in the reports is difficult to comprehend. In some cases it is hard to see where the data comes from. Is the instructor being compared to other faculty in his or her department, division, school, to faculty here at Loyola, or at other universities?
      4. How will the IDEA survey, once the issues of implementation have been resolved, be used as an instrument of faculty evaluation? (TC: the US has recommended a weight of *at most* 50% of an overall annual evaluation.)
      5. JF: by some reports, if you get two or more readings in the "lower" or "much lower" areas, you will get a conversation from someone in your "chain of command" about your performance.
      6. HM: issue about the mandatory designation of essential questions for multiple sections of a single course: is this a possible interference with the instructors' academic freedom? It appears that the utility of uniform evaluation trumps the utility of academic freedom here.
      7. Low response rate and self-selection issue. In many departments, when ratings were carried out on paper, response rates were as high as 90% or more. What impact will a sudden change in a response rate to, say, 30% make upon course evaluations?

8. Several members of Council, particularly from MNSN and SoE, however, reported that their own several years' experience with the new system had been positive and not onerous in terms of work-load to faculty. They found that the feedback the IDEA survey had given had been helpful in evaluating their teaching and suggesting ways of improving pedagogically.

9. What about the factoring of grades into evaluations? (Especially for multiple graders/sections in a single course, where different grading may be going on.)

7. Discussion of IT problems

   o Microsoft Outlook and Exchange: does LUC have the full version of Out-look and Exchange? According to IT, we do; according to some faculty who use Outlook and Exchange at other institutions, our version lacks sig-nificant functionality.
   o GroupWise archives were supposed to extend for 2 years, but the shift over to Outlook has been badly handled; some users have ended up having their archives truncated to a few months.
   o Mailing list construction and saving is shaky and problematic in Outlook
   o Desktop client and web versions of Outlook often do not sync. (One user reports being unable to empty his trash folder for weeks in his desktop cli-ent; he succeeded only within the web, and then only after considerable technical assistance from IT.)
   o More training on the new IT systems is called for. This will be especially important with the new Faculty Activity System (FAS), the Faculty Infor-mation Form system at IDEA, and other new "initiatives" currently in the pipeline onto faculty desks.
   o There has recently been a considerable upsurge in the amount of spam mail reaching faculty inboxes despite the presence of so-called spam-filtering software on Loyola's mail servers. Why is this occurring? Can anything be done about it?
   o There is some concern that faculty email addresses are open and exposed on the Loyola website; this makes it easy for spambot programs to harvest these addresses and use them to direct spam emails to us. Could the Uni-versity please adopt some system of shielding these addresses from expo-sure, or rewriting them so as to be unusable to such programs?
   o Problems with Sakai: announcement emails do not seem to be reaching stu-dent addressees 100% of the time; one faculty member estimates about a 5% failure rate.
   o There seem to be considerable lag times in email transmissions, even within the Loyola system. Some faculty report delays of up to 10 or 12 hours in the delivery of emails from one account to another.

Faculty suggest that we have an IT spokesperson commitment to address us and per-haps give us some hands on, on-screen assistance with some of these problems, and oth-ers we might have.

8. Motion to adjourn: Moved (Lash); second (Kelly). Meeting adjourned 4:42pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary