

Notes from FC Retreat
Tuesday, August 23, 2005
Alanah Fitch, secretary

Opening Statement from Jerry McD.:

Issues this year that we may wish to focus on are: 1. Transparency of decision making; 2. Shared Governance; 3. The faculty linkage between Lakeside University and Medical Center Academic Units; 4. Benefits and Communication of those benefits from HR.

John Fren dreis Meeting with the Faculty Council: Has become evident that FC has legitimacy in ways that the administration does not. Would like to work with FC. Indicated that during the "Time of Troubles" the administrators were scarred as well as the faculty and there was a move toward secrecy which has to be broken.

John sees three main ways in which he, as administrator, can work with Faculty Council:

1. Faculty council should essentially recreate its Committee on Committees so that it can forward names to JF for the committees which he appoint. He reserves the opportunity to add names of folks who might have skills – example he added three names to the Rome Center committee in addition to 7 names suggested by FC members this summer based on skills in internships, institutional affinity, and member of a school he thought should have some input.
2. Potentially there are some things FC can play an oversight/sponsorship role in: Center for Faculty Professional Development (along with, possibly, Council of Deans).
3. Some things that are considered could be beneficial to be discussed by a broader venue: - moving towards different types of faculty: "clinical faculty: part time faculty: how does this affect the quality of education.

John was asked if the FC could come to him directly on issues/complaints. Yes.

Other comments from John were with respect to enrollment/health of University figures: 500-600 more Full time U.G. this year. Hope to stabilize enrollment at 16,000 as an equilibrium number. If the number of applications go up we can become a hotter school, more selective and up our yield from 20% of acceptances to more like 50% enjoined by "hot" schools. Current waiting list of students openings depend on housing openings. 2/3 years ago did not have the knowledge to link housing openings with students. The high enrollment is, indeed, linked to the Baby Boomlet which should peak in 2009/2010 – therefore our goal is to get to be a hotter place before the downturn. This will be somewhat difficult because we still want to retain the type of student (1st generation student) as we have traditionally served.

Rest of Meeting Notes:

Relationship of FC to the Shared Governance Structure – closest linkage we have is definitely Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs University Policy Committees; prior motion was to have this linkage set in concrete in some fashion; until then we anticipate a close working relationship with Jim Calcagno.

Discussion of the role of the University Coordinating Committee and its role in funneling issues/policy discussions toward the various University Policy Committees. The committee is made up of Fren dreis, Babado, 1 faculty member from each campus one of whom is the chair of FC, the chair of staff council and some administrators. The two faculty not chair of FC are supposed to be voted upon at large by faculty, but nobody remembers ever voting for them. Kim D'Angelo, who has served on this committee, thinks it is too small and needs an additional 3 faculty members. One reason this is a problem (according to Kim) is there is a large turnover. At the moment the only one who is holdover is Barbados. Population should be staggered to keep more holdovers. It is supposed to serve as a funnel to the committees and recommends and approves committee members. She thinks that it also needs to have the role of oversight on these committees: discussion on this point eventually agreed that there was not uniform protocol for the functioning of the committees (vote/consensus; reporting back) also found that the topics addressed by the committees don't always seem to funnel through the UCC. Our discussion also hit upon the point that we don't have a good discussion of what policy actually is.

Some suggestions were made to formalize the role of FC apart from the Committee on Committee role suggested by Fren dreis.

1. Require chair of Academic or Faculty Affairs University Policy Committees to seek input from FC
 2. Require the forwarded policy to obtain a vote of approval from FC and/or append commentary of FC discussion on the policy to their draft policy forwarded to Father G.
 3. Allow FC to send the policy back to committee to be reworked before forwarding to Father G.
 4. Make sure that the Faculty Affairs University Policy Committee have several FC members on it
 5. Require Faculty Affairs University Policy Committee to meet with FC to explain the policy once before the policy moves forward to Father G.
-

Stuff to Be brought before Father G. by Jerry McD.

1. Who should be on the Taskforce?
 - a. Size ~ 9 Faculty (some consideration given to different campuses, interest groups)
Larger size could be a problem but could use the larger size to divide up the work of meeting with stakeholders
 - b. Names

Linda Heath – former Vice Provost, skilled in social psychology
 Prudence Moylin – Served on FC and has researched various forms of governance
 Vic Ottati, research area is psychology of small groups will be able to work well
 Donna Bryzdzunas – Pediatrics – President of LUMC Senate – brings Stritch in
 Bren Murphy, former chair of FC, Chair of a Department, Program director
 Frank Fennel, Chair of English
 Fran Glasser 9 School of Nursing, qual of work life, good on processes of small groups
 Jeff Doering, Chair of Biology (sciences)
 John McNalty – basic sciences at Med Center, has been on multiple university committees
 Susan Speight, Education, educational psychology, good on counseling
 Tom Tobias, S. J., on the Board of Trustees at Marquette, Theology
 Vefa Tarhan, Endowed Chair of Finance, good head on budget issues
 John Rastolansky, head of accounting, associate Dean
 Pat Simpson (some overlap with AAUP)

2. Who Should Chair the Task Force

- i. Alan Schoenberg – Law, multiple years at Loyola, multiple terms as FC President
- ii. . Paul Jay – highly active in setting up the structure, well respected

3. Process:

- a. Timing – Preliminary report to be disseminated to stakeholders by end of fall, formal process for commentary, final report in spring
- b. Consultation – Council of Deans, Research Services, Academic Council, Faculty Senate at Stritch, Staff Council, Council of Chairs, Executive Faculty Group (- Council of Chairs at Med Center), United Students Group, Graduate School Council, Graduate Student Organization, Library Council, AAUP: Who represents P.T. and Contract Faculty? Should be consulted
- c. What to measure?
 - i. What policies have been looked at? Have they been adopted, how well have they worked? (Use numeric)
 - ii. How many administrative decisions have been made outside of the structure that are policy in nature during this time period?
 - iii. Of the policies moving through the structure who initiates them? Faculty, FC? Administrators? Use numerics – try to get at are we simply bringing things in to make policy after a bad decision?
 - iv. Why is a program approved a policy?
 - v. How many of the policies or actions taken by the committees have gone through the UCC?

- vi. How many of these issues are actually policy issues? (Is listening to Bob Ward a policy issue?) – what does this say about how the chair is using the committee to cover his own decisions?
- d. Issues to investigate?
 - i. What constitutes policy and not issues?
 - ii. How are the actions of the committees overseen? (Why did Research Committee never meet?)
 - iii. How are the policies tracked – why don't they go back through UCC?
 - iv. How do policy issues end up in front of the committee without going through UCC?
 - v. What is the charter of each UPC in light of ad hoc revisions (e.g. Core now goes across campuses?)
 - vi. How do the different committees operate and why do they operate differently in terms of process (how decisions are made – vote, consensus, return to committee, reporting back to UCC, reporting back to affected stakeholders?)