

University Senate
General Assembly Special Meeting
Minutes
November 29, 2021

Senators Present: Suzanne Bost, Laura Brentner, Anthony Deldin, Jenna Drenten, William Duffy, Yvonne El Ashmawi, Eve Geroulis, Sarita Heer, Lee Hood, Kristin Krueger, Patricia Lee, Joe Mitzenmacher, Maria Wathen, Matthew Williams, Bill Adams, Karen Cornelius, Anne Divita Kopacz, Tobyn Friar, Kevin Newman, Erla Dervishi, Mereya Riopedre, Abby Abuya, Jonathan Okstad, Emily Barman, Thomas Kelly, Teresa Krafcisin, Justyna Canning (*ex. officio*), Tavis Jules (*ex. officio*)

Absent: Minerva Ahumada, Francis Alonzo, Leo Irakliotis, Wei Qui, Selam Kashay, Matt Lorentz, Elani Williams, Margaret Callahan (*ex. officio*)

Quorum (26/33): Voting members present at start of meeting; quorum is **satisfied**.

Chair Heer called the meeting to order at 3:02 PM.

I. Review of preliminary agenda and call for motions to amend

No motions to amend.

II. Discussion: Shared Governance Task Force (SGTF)

Chair Heer introduced the meeting's topics of conversation: the Senate's purpose, how to reconstitute Senate, and Senate's role on the rainbow chart of Academic Approvals.

Discussion:

Senate's Purpose

- Sen. Heer said that if an issue affects more than one constituency, the issue should come to Senate as the Senate has representation from multiple constituencies. Sen. Lee agreed that Senate has a broader purpose than Faculty Council. Sen. Adams also agreed.
- Sen. Bost said that the value of Senate is that it helps consider impacts on staff and students, particularly related to academic decisions. Sen. M. Williams agreed that having a forum for every constituency is important.
- Sen. Adams said that Senate should retain power over lines related to reorganization and change as that impacts staff and students, too.
- Sen. Kelly asked how Senate interfaces with other shared governance groups.



Reconstituting the Senate

- Chair Heer proposed that Senate have 9 faculty (3 from each campus), 9 staff (3 from each campus), 9 students (5 undergrad and 4 graduate), 2 administration, and 3 ex-officio. Sen. M. Williams expressed concern about the 9 students representing both graduate and undergraduate issues. Sen. Deldin asked where the number 9 came from. Chair Heer said that the 9 came from the 3 campuses. Sen. Hood said that 3-3-3 is not proportional to the number of departments and schools per campus and suggested having a more complicated formula for deciding representation from each campus.
- Sen. Mitzenmacher pointed out that librarians represent all three campuses and are considered faculty. He asks how they will be counted in a 3-3-3 model.
- Sen. Kelly said that GPAC is the umbrella graduate student government. GSAC represents the Graduate School only. He continued that there is value in ensuring representation from each of the campuses, but they are not equal in population.
- Sen. Krafcisin suggested that the Senate be more of an executive committee that has representation from Faculty Council and Staff Council. Sen. Barman echoed this suggestion, particularly as it enhances collaboration with other shared governance groups. Sen. Kelly said that the purpose of Senate needs to be determined before the structure is determined. A coordinating body is one possible purpose.
- Sen. M. Williams said that a directly representational model is more valuable than an indirect representational model. Ex officio roles between shared governance bodies can help ensure coordination and collaboration among the bodies.
- Sen. Lee suggested 7 or 5 representatives from each constituency. Of the 7 faculty, one could be from libraries and then 2 from each campus. For students, the number should decrease similar to how faculty representation is decreasing on Senate.
- Sen. Jules suggested 6 so 2 people would come from each campus. Senate should be based on issues that impact us all in the One Loyola model, not based on divisions and campuses. Faculty Council already has representation from each faculty division.
- Sen. M. Williams said that ideally Senators would look at issues from the perspective of others, but human perspective is limited. Therefore, Senate should have a larger number of representatives from each constituency to have true representation. Sen. Duffy said that geographic representation is good in theory, but he has not seen it work well in practice.
- Sen. Wathen said the talk of numbers is premature if the Senate has not decided its function first. Chair Heer outlined some options that have been



floated: 1) Faculty, staff, and student groups would filter issues up to Senate, or 2) Senate only deals with issues that cuts across constituents.

- Sen. Wathen said that it might be simpler if Faculty Council and Senate overlap in their review and recommend on a limited number of academic approval lines.
- Sen. Okstad asked if there is a representative body for adjuncts. Chair Heer said that adjuncts do not have a representative body at Loyola. Sen. Okstad that that a geography-based structure might be limiting when people are remote. He also asked that graduate students be fairly represented in shared governance.
- Sen. M. Williams asked the Bylaws Committee to consider including adjuncts, as the unionized adjuncts have some longevity at Loyola, but he recognized that adjuncts may be too busy to be involved.
- Sen. Duffy noted that some schools may not have representatives if Senate moved to a geography-based model and that Senate also needs to represent the interests of remote campuses.

Senate on the Rainbow Chart of Academic Approvals

- Sen. Adams asked why the Senate's Executive Committee wanted to retain review and recommend power over elimination of programs but not the creation. These issues do not come up often and Senate would not slow them down if Senate can call meetings at any time.
- Sen. M. Williams suggested that Faculty Council review and recommend lines 27, 29, 35, 42, and 43. Senate would review and recommend lines 26, 30, 34, and 38.
- Sen. Krafcisin recommended better defining a reorganization versus an elimination to make it clear which shared governance body would have jurisdiction.
- Sen. Jules said that Faculty Council feels that lines 29-46 should be under Faculty Council's purview but does not want to slow down the process. A question is if Staff Council and Faculty Council should be added to the rainbow chart, or what Senate will give up to allow Faculty Council to have a place on the rainbow chart.
- Sen. Hood was pleased to hear that lines 34 and 36 are so rare that Provost Callahan is willing to add another layer of review.
- Sen. Wathen suggested giving line 26 to Faculty Council. Sen. Hood suggested also giving line 30 to Faculty Council. Chair Heer suggested that reorganization (lines 38, 39, 40) remain in Senate as they are multiconstituency.
- Chair Heer and Sen. Hood reviewed a proposal developed by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee suggested that Faculty Council have Review/Recommend for 26-30, 35, 38, 39, 40, and 42, and Senate retains



Review/Recommend for 34 and 36. For context, Faculty Council requested Review/Recommend for 34, 35, 36, 38, 42.

- Sen. Adams suggested that Senate retain line 35.
- Chair Heer asked staff Senators if they thought Staff Council would want to be on the rainbow chart. Sen. Canning stated that she was hesitant to answer as some in Staff Council might want a presence on the chart if Faculty Council has a presence. Sen. Adams cautioned that Senate's power might be weakened. Sen. Wathen said that staff are represented on the rainbow chart through Senate. Sen. Kelly added that Senate was given academic review because it was a heavily faculty body.
- Sen. Wathen called for a straw poll on the lines under discussion.

Votes:

Should Senate retain 38?

Yes 17

No 5

Abstain 3

Should Senate retain 39 and 40?

Yes 18

No 5

Abstain 1

Should Senate retain 35?

Yes 13

No 9

Abstain 4

- Sen. Lee asked if Executive Council would need to review its original recommendation at a separate meeting based on these votes. Chair Heer said that the recommendation would be adjusted during this Senate meeting based on the voting.
- Sen. Wathen said Senators should base Review/Recommend votes based on whether the action supports the University's research and academic aims, not on whether it would be implemented well. Sen. M. Williams suggested Faculty Council oversee creation of programs as faculty are the experts on academic direction. Senate should oversee eliminating programs because this impacts staff and students, too.
- Sen. Jules asked the Senate to consider how the administration will see the Senate's recommendations and to consider what Review/Recommend and Informational mean. Sen. Hood asked Sen. Jules for his reaction to the Executive Committee proposal. Sen. Jules agreed with the Executive



Committee proposal to give Faculty Council 26-30 and 42. Sen. M. Williams suggested that we consider what would be acceptable to the provost.

- Sen. Kelly asked whether the Shared Governance Task Force is working on realigning the approval chart. Chair Heer and Sen. Jules confirmed that Senate and the Faculty Council were tasked with the next steps on the rainbow chart of approvals. The provost makes the final decision regarding the rainbow chart.
- Sen. M. Williams asked if there can be a joint session of Senate and Faculty Council to reach a combined set of recommendations.
- Sen. Lee motioned for a vote on giving Faculty Council 26-30 and 42. Chair Heer seconded.

Votes:

Should Faculty Council gain 26? Senate will have informational review on all numbers.

Yes 20

No 3

Abstain 1

Should Faculty Council gain 27?

Yes 21

No 2

Abstain 1

Should Faculty Council gain 28?

Yes 19

No 4

Abstain 1

Should Faculty Council gain 29?

Yes 20

No 3

Abstain 1

Should Faculty Council gain 30?

Yes 20

No 2

Abstain 2

Should Faculty Council gain 42?

Yes 19

No 2

Abstain 3



- Sen. Lee motioned for a vote on Senate retaining review and recommend and Faculty Council gaining review and recommend on 34 and 36. Sen. Adams seconded.

Should Senate retain review and recommend and Faculty Council gain review and recommend on 34 and 36?

Yes 20

No 1

Abstain 2

- Sen. Adams motioned for a vote on Senate retaining review and recommend and Faculty Council gaining review and recommend on 35, 38, 39, and 40. Chair Heer seconded.
- Chair Heer and Sen. Jules agreed that for issues for which both Senate and Faculty Council have review and recommend power, the issue goes to Faculty Council first. Sen. Dervishi noted that the Executive Council proposal recommended that the Faculty Council and Senate coordinate their meetings to move issues quickly through the bodies. Chair Heer said that the two bodies typically meet the same week already.

Should Senate retain review and recommend and Faculty Council gain review and recommend for 35?

Yes 16

No 5

Abstain 1

Should Senate retain review and recommend and Faculty Council gain review and recommend for 38?

Yes 16

No 5

Abstain 1

Should Senate retain review and recommend and Faculty Council gain review and recommend for 39?

Yes 16

No 5

Abstain 1

Should Senate retain review and recommend and Faculty Council gain review and recommend for 40?

Yes 16

No 5

Abstain 1

- Sen. Okstad requested that the University communicate with students when major changes happen like a new school or institute or provost transition.
- Chair Heer summarized: Both Senate and Faculty Council would review and recommend on lines 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 40, with issues going to Faculty Council first.
- Sen. Kelly pointed out there was more consensus on 26-30 and 42 than 35, 38, 39, and 40.
- Sen. Jules expressed concern about how the process will work with the double review and recommend. One example: If an issue goes to Faculty Council first, does the issue get revised before it goes to Senate? Or does the issue go to Faculty Council and Senate, then get revised? He said that these issues will not be rarities given the changing landscape of higher education. Chair Heer advised bringing process questions to the provost.
- Sen. Jules recommended that each shared governance body has ex officio members from the other two bodies to promote collaboration and communication.

Additional Discussion

- Chair Heer called for another meeting to discuss the composition of the Senate. Sen. Jules asked that the meeting be held in the next 7 days so the Faculty Handbook revision process can continue.
- Sen. Duffy asked if the Senate can reject any of the Shared Governance Task Force recommendations on the structure of the Senate. Sen. Jules said that the Senate has already approved doing a restructuring.

III. Other

Sen. Lee motioned for adjournment; Sen. Kelly seconded.

General Assembly meeting adjourned at 5:06 PM.

Respectfully Submitted ADK 1/18/22

Senate Meeting Schedule for Academic Year 2021-22

General Assembly Meetings

• September 10	3:00-5:30PM	Zoom
• October 15	3:00-5:00PM	Zoom
• November 19	3:00-5:00PM	Zoom
• January 28	3:00-5:00PM	Zoom
• February 25	3:00-5:00PM	Zoom
• March 25	3:00-5:00PM	Zoom

- April 22 3:00-5:00PM Zoom

Executive Committee Meetings

- ~~August 26 3:00-5:00PM Zoom~~
- ~~October 1 3:00-5:00PM Zoom~~
- ~~November 5 3:00-5:00PM Zoom~~
- January 14 3:00-5:00PM Zoom
- February 11 3:00-5:00PM Zoom
- March 11 3:00-5:00PM Zoom
- April 8 3:00-5:00PM Zoom