

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Minutes**  
**Wednesday, March 28, 2012**  
**3:00-5:00 PM – TSC 303-4, WTC**

**Members Present:** Battaglia, G.; Boller, H.; Bowen, R.; Currie, J.; Derhammer, N.; Dominiak, M.; Embrick, D.; Fitch, A.; Hermansen, M.; Jay, W.; Jurgensmeier, SJ, C.; Kilbane, T.; Leone, G.; Lococo, M.; Mirza, D.; Miller, H.; Penckofer, S.; Ramsey, G.; Ruppman, T.; Schoenberger, A.; Udo, M.; Wojcik, E.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:05pm by Gordon Ramsey.
2. Invocation – Charles Jurgensmeier, SJ.
3. Approval of February minutes. Amendments for attendance; added motion *in re* G. Battaglia. Motion: Jurgensmeier; Penckofer seconded. Motion passed 17-0-0.
4. Chair's Report
  - The new "University Senate": The Office of the Provost has handed down a new proposal, to supercede that of a Faculty Senate, for a "University Senate," to consist of representatives from student body, staff, faculty, and administration. This body will treat issues that are common to all constituencies. It is envisaged (though not yet conclusively agreed) that the former elected bodies of Faculty Council, Staff Council, and USG will continue to exist and will be charged with responsibility for issues relevant solely to their particular constituencies. Further discussion below.
  - Dean's Evaluation Committee: we are still working on the sample proposal for the Dean's evaluation form. The form has been shortened (by about 50%) from our old form, and the headings of the questions brought more into line with the main headings of the Provost's own evaluation instrument. A final draft will be ready for the April meeting of Faculty Council.
  - Elections: are now underway. All lists are now up to date. Vacancies exist in Humanities, Natural Sciences, Libraries, and Clinical Medicine. The deadline is April 6<sup>th</sup>. All of these divisions and schools should have gotten e-mails. (We should also be prepared for possible elections to a University Senate, if it goes through; the option of the administration appointing an initial membership I find unacceptable on shared governance grounds.)
  - USG elections are now underway. I will meet with the newly elected leadership; it is good to keep these lines of communication open.
  - No word yet on the final report from AAUPC. I will (hopefully) have information by next month's meeting.
  - I have as yet received no comments on the new core curriculum outline; if members have any comments, please submit them for next month's meeting.

5. Report by Sue Penckofer, member of Task Force: “Positioning LUC for the Future: Improving Quality While Containing Costs,” which reports to the Board of Trustees:

- Our external auditors, Deloitte & Touche, have called the present situation a “perfect storm,” with declining funding from governments, reduced returns from endowments, waning of private financing sources, and rising costs due to a variety of factors like aging infrastructures and increased demands from student consumers. The question arises: how should Loyola respond? The task force will answer this question by studying external and internal forces that drive tuition pricing and looking for efficiencies or new business models that will allow us to move forward in our strategic planning and improve quality while mitigating the need for tuition increases.

The committee has met four times to date the co-chairs have met with the president and provost. We began by using the Deloitte & Touche report, “Making the Grade in 2011” and the book *The Innovative University: Changing the DNA of Higher Education from the Inside Out*. (The book focuses on the so-called “Utah model”—with its emphasis on online education. Father Garanzini seems not to be convinced that online education is the way to go; we would in any event be facing stiff competition with Gonzaga University, which is the leading Jesuit University in online education in the United States.)

Research is now underway to collect relevant institutional comparative data to chart Loyola’s current position, strengths, and liabilities. Deloitte & Touche may have a limited consulting engagement in an advisory role. A leadership questionnaire will be distributed to the deans and to the president’s cabinet in February and March. Between March and May there will be small group meetings with Board of Trustees members, a student focus group discussion, and the beginnings of a draft of the report. The final report is due to be submitted to the Board of Trustees in September.

- Question: by calling a course “online,” does the university mean that all class sessions are online? SP: not yet defined. Remark: in the school of social work, courses which were 75% or more—but not 100%—were termed a “hybrid”; those which were 35%-75% were designated “blended.” Question: was there any discussion of costs: faculty salaries, administrative fees—and in what ratio? SP: not yet. Remark: faculty work longer hours teaching online courses. The University saves on classroom, infrastructure costs; and it does not have to pay the faculty more for their increased hours. Is this a potentially exploitative practice? Faculty should be concerned.

6. New “University Senate” Proposal

- GR: the timing of this proposal was somewhat odd. The USG and the Staff Council have been working on proposals for University Senate for a while; I knew about the USG proposal, but the Staff Council proposal was a surprise to me. About 75%-80% of our old Faculty Senate proposal has been

ported over to the new University Senate proposal; the rest seems to have come from the other two proposals. The Office of the Provost is presenting this University Senate proposal as its own initiative, but it seems clear that it has at least the backing, if it did not originate from, the Office of the President. As to why this proposal has appeared at this time, it's difficult to say. The President and senior administrators, early in the year, seemed attracted to the idea of an inclusive University Senate that would have had members from administration, the student body, staff, and faculty; but they relented when we convinced them of the necessity of the Faculty Senate. At this point the claim is that they simply decided to go back to that idea; but the administration has been bothered in our negotiations over the faculty Senate, with issues like the Faculty Caucus and faculty term limits. (I specifically asked administrators why they had changed their minds about the Faculty Senate and were now supporting the University Senate proposal, no one replied to the question.) The University Senate may, therefore, be in part an attempt to make an end run around these issues.

The new University Senate will have 33 members, 30 voting. Of the thirty voting members, fifteen will be faculty; five will be staff; seven students; and three administrators.

- Discussion: is the Faculty Senate now a “defunct” proposal, wholly replaced by the University Senate? GR: yes. Faculty Council remain as a “constituent body.” Question: what will the University Senate consider as its issues? GR. Global issues, common to all the university constituencies, not specific ones for each particular constituency. At least, that is what I think we need to push. Question: the Faculty Senate proposal looks like it was too good to be true. The new University Senate will not permit faculty to have direct input with administrators on faculty issues; administrators will not attend Faculty Council. (Compare the SSOM Medical Council meetings—they have no substantial content.) Remark: I have asked Father Garanzini what issues he thought could be settled in the six Faculty Senate meetings originally scheduled for next year; he could only come up with tuition increases in salary increases. I'm worried the University Senate will become a rubber stamp, or decide issues only of a very irrelevant and vague generality. Administrators prefer to make decisions by themselves, and call it “shared governance.” (“Shared governance” is also needed for accreditation.) It's an issue of will, not of right. Question what issues do the Staff Council and USG envision being discussed? GR: I asked the Provost, and he could only come up with the strategic plan, and student affairs issues. Question: is there an organizational chart yet? GR: for now, the new University Senate, the Faculty Council, the USG, and the Staff Council are four separate bodies, all reporting to the Office of the President. But the document for the University Senate calls the other three bodies “constituency,” thus implying that they report to the University Senate. This needs to be

resolved. Question: who will decide about issues like the Faculty Handbook, promotion and tenure, *etc.*? The University Senate? Not only is it not qualified to decide these issues, it would be an interference with academic freedom for them to. GR: clearly, these decisions must remain with the Faculty Council. Remark: the University Senate documentation mentions “collaborative organizations.” Faculty membership in these collaborative organizations must be elected by the faculty, not appointed by the administration. Question: what about the role of the UPC’s, which were going to become committees of the Faculty Senate? GR: clearly, those dealing with the faculty should go to the Faculty Council, not to the new University Senate. Question: will the administration put this University Senate proposal to a whole-faculty vote? GR: it’s unclear, but we certainly hope so. Remark: multiple bodies in decision-making structures tend to consolidate into fewer ones, and even into single ones. We want to be on that body. Question: would it be possible perhaps to postpone a decision on the University Senate for a year, to fix UPC issues first? GR: we’ve been trying to fix the UPC issues through the new Faculty Senate model, but the administration has now changed its mind. Question: how can we get face-to-face meetings with the administrators on this? GR: I’d like the Faculty Senate task force to meet again, and include USG and Staff Council members.

- **Motion: Faculty Council must remain autonomous from the University Senate and report directly to the President on issues of faculty concern.**  
Moved (Boller); second (Mirza). Passed: 19-0-0.

7. Motion to adjourn (Mirza), seconded (Kilbane). Meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm.

Respectfully submitted by  
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary