

Feb. 15, 2006

Faculty Council Minutes

Recorded by Alanah Fitch

Attending: Alanah Fitch, David Mirza, Nick Lash, Tom DeStefani, Linda Paskiewicz, Patti Jung, John Makowski, Chris Kendrick, Robert Bireley, S. J., Walter Jay, William Schmidt, Harvey Boller, Ian Boussy, Gordon Ramsey, Marta Lundy, Allen Schoenberger, Alan Raphael, Gloria Jacobson, Thackery Gray, David Lynn, Janis Fine, Peter J. Schaefer, Kim Dell'Angela, Gerry McDonald

I. Invocation - Marta Lundy

II. Report from Acting Provost John Frendreis (JF).

JF submitted a report (below) with inserted comments and questions. Original document is in normal font, comments and discussion are italic

Update on Recent Issues Discussed with Council
Feb 15, 2006

I want to report to the Council on a number of issues or questions raised with me by either the full Council or the Council's Executive Committee

Benchmark Institutions - The Executive Committee requested that information on the often-cited benchmark institutions be made readily available to interested parties. This information can now be found on the Institutional Research website at <http://www.luc.edu/depts/ir/-peer.html>

Dean's Evaluations - The deans have been provided with the instrument to be used by FC to evaluate deans, for their review and comments. They raised no issues with the current instrument.

Faculty Salary Market Evaluation - The Faculty Salary data will be available from CUPA-HR on March 17th, at which time IR will work with my office to replicate our work from three years ago. If the analysis reveals significant shortfalls in faculty pay from the 60th percentile level we wish to maintain (with the benchmark private urban peer institutions to which I refer above), I will develop a proposal to address this in the FY08 budget. In any case, I will report back to the FC on this analysis at a later meeting. *JF indicated that the overall average raise (bump) had been 18%.*

Core Curriculum - I have filled a vacancy on the University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC) with Dr. Jack Kerkerling (English). Dr. Kerkerling is a member of the Curriculum Committee of academic Council and has participated in the CADE workshop on learning outcomes, which will prove highly beneficial as the UCCC continues its process of evaluating the new core's success in fostering student learning. I have now received a referral from the UCC to take the policy question of how the requirements of thematic student learning in justice and diversity should be structured

to the AA-UPC for review and recommendation, which I will do in the next week. The UCC is scheduled to discuss at its next meeting my request that core curriculum policy questions be taken to the AA-UPC as a matter of course going forward. *JF commented that he is using his power to create overlapping memberships from UPCs and non-UPCS such as the UCCC. Ian Boussy asked about the taking issues directly to the AAUPC while bypassing the UCC (University Coordinating Committee). JF responded that asking to have materials move directly from UCCC to the AAUPC is not related to the departmental appeal of the UCCC decisions but is intended to look at policy related to making decisions. Gerry McD. Commented that the problem is that the UCCC sits “out there” outside of the policy committee structure and that by taking material directly from the UCCC to the AA-UPC will allow the AA-UPC to have watchdog role over the UCCC. Ian Boussy expressed concern that the past provost used the AAUPC to enforce his decisions over the core. JF said that this year it would be difficult to construe the AAUPC as being his watchdog. IB also worried that bypassing the UCC (university coordinating committee) renders that committee irrelevant? JF said many items are taken directly to the UPCs without going to the UCC and that shared governance review may address the role of the UCC if there are concerns.*

Library Board - The Library Board has been reconstituted; the new membership can be found at <http://www.luc.edu/committees/libraryboard/> I have appointed Bob Bucholz (History) as the chair of the Board.

Faculty Leaves and Summer Research Grants - IU have prepared a separate handout to be discussed today on this topic; the basic longitudinal data will be posted on an Academic Affairs website http://www.luc.edu/academicaffairs/policies/leaves/faculty_development.shtml#paid as was the case in previous years. *JF pointed out that there were 74% funded leave proposals (not including the mid-probationary leaves for non-tenured faculty) which was the second highest number in the reported years (1994-2006). He indicated that there were the number of applications were increasing from the low year of 2002-2003. JF also said that the program is essentially unfunded - paid by slack in the system and that the President is looking the set aside an endowment which will provide real dollars (not necessarily 1:1 _ so that the department gets back some amount of money for replacements. The provost’s office funded 30 summer leaves and the rest came from the Deans’ gift budgets. The long term goal is to have committees of FC work to assess research support and determine where money should be spent to facilitate research. JF went on to say that the proposal endorsed by faculty council to have automatic leaves every 7 years is “anti-meritocratic). It may be the wrong solution to the right problem of not enough leaves. He said that he could guaranteed that there would be no move to have both an automatic guaranteed leave and a competitive leave program.*

Academic Calendar - The Registrar is reviewing the AY06-77 (and subsequent) academic calendars to bring them into alignment with the recommendations made by the AA-UPC this fall, which I have accepted. The registrar is also reviewing the final exam schedule (modeling with historical student data) to determine a final exam schedule that will spread students’ exams out more evenly across the final exam period. I hope to have this work completed and announced by mid-March.

JF went on to comment on the Faculty Appeals and Grievances Procedure. He said that a) it is

necessary to take into account the legitimate interests of individual faculty and of the collective university. B) There will always be specific factions which will be problematic. JF has recommended to the President that the President re-engage the group and seek a longer dialog on the document. Two specific issues are a) presence of legal counsel... could be become adversarial; b) keeping faculty on hire while the appeal moves forward - this would invite someone to appeal on frivolous grounds in order to be kept on staff after dismissal. He had further comments on the administrations desire to avoid designing a cumbersome procedure.

III. Refort from Staff Council, Rebecca Stolz

- A. A major issue for the staff is short term disability pay. While faculty generally can get fellow faculty to cover for illness, staff rarely have that opportunity. Disability pay does not kick in until after 6 months. Only “high-end” staff have short term disability. A proposal has gone to the Finance UPC.
- B. Staff council has endorsed partners benefits
- C. She had reports that the Faculty Member of the Year Award was well received at the Dec. Banquet.
- D. TGITHurs collaboration with FC is going well.
- E. One Book One University :”The Travels of a T-shirt in the Global Economy: an Economist Examines the Markets, Power, and Politics of World Trade” Conversations with the Author to occur April 20, 2006

Walter Jay asked about the short term disability issue: further discussion revealed: Federal Medical Leave Act protects the job but not the salary. Staff below the ranking of “director” do not have short term disability. The title “director” is an HR term and many different jobs have the description without being similar. Allen Shoenberger said that there is no written document on short term disability - you have to ask or you will not know that there is short term disability for faculty. Dawn Lynn said that it is problematic because you have to call HR and get the right person to know what is really happening. Allen Shoenberger asked about whether there is a push to have the benefit committee reconstituted - was fragmented under the UPC committee structure. Rebecca indicated that as far as SC can ascertain decisions are made and then communicated and that the SC is afraid to push to much for fear of pushback. Several comments were made that the FC should put the issue of short term disability on its agenda to convey its sentiments to the Budget and Finance committee.

Kim Dell’Angela wanted to know how staff benefits are communicated to the medical campus. Staff has yet to cross that bridge. Patricia Jung indicated that staff she talked to did not like having the faculty awards at the Dec. banquet.

IV Approval of January Minutes - passed unanimously

V. Committee Reports

Allen Shoenberger - **Faculty Appeals /Grievance Procedures**

Gerry McD. Opened the discussion saying that Jim Calcagno, Chair of FAUPC is not interested in having this document back again. He also said that he suggested to Father G that we considered FAUPC as an advisor to FC and Father G and that we should move on this document in that spirit.

Allen began his comments by saying that the FAUPC has tried in two years to revise a document for tenure which took 6 years to develop and, in addition, draft a grievance procedure and have worked exceptionally hard.

Report from the subcommittee.

The committee looked at the UPC rosters and found no representation of nursing, law, education on the FAUPC drafting the Appeals and Grievance Document, which accounts for many of the problems that he, as a law school member, found with the document. The committee looked at the internet for a survey of other procedures and found wide variety of how the appeals committee is nominated, selected. Also wide variance in the specific procedures allowed, such as presence of counsel, ability to sum up information. Shoenberger said that the procedure should prevent that retaliation of administration to faculty. The survey of other institutions also showed specific institutions allow one to grieve only against the administration and not against faculty/staff. Another document spelled out examples of what can not be grieved. The core issue is the committee makeup.

Gerry indicated that his vision is that we ask Father G to meet with F.C. following a brief letter of main issues to Father G.

Gerry introduced a special visitor**(NAME PLEASE!!)** Who teaches in the area of academic grievance procedures and conflict resolution in higher education.

Patti Jung - said that there is a consensus that there are deep flaws with the document as received. We should not expect to negotiate small changes with Father G. Through the Executive committee, but will need to have a subcommittee of FC work on it.

Gerry - said that he had not intended to imply that negotiations would be carried out at the EC level. However he also said that he was not sure that Father G would be comfortable discussing the document with the entire FC.

Kim D. Said that we should give references to a number of other existing documents, and a short list of specific problematic areas to be addressed.

Several people indicated that the process was so complex that flow chart needed to be made official to the document. There needs to be a process document.

Peter Schaefer said that in reading the report from the Allen's subcommittee he was struck with how many comments made by FC subcommittee and forwarded to the fAUPC were not dealt with. Allen said that there is not requirement of FAUPC to write a response indicating which comments were dealt with and which were ignored and for what reason.

Peter Schaefer said that this was a substantial issue for the shared governance review.

Kim D. Said that this is a good test case of shared governance in getting appropriate communications and review from both UPC and FC.

VI. Marta Lundy -

Asked FC to proceed with the survey being submitted by the Faculty Development Center as information is necessary to proceed with planning.

VII. Chair's Report

Gerry Indicated that librarians at Maywood are eligible to vote, but not counted in the process for a number of years.

