

Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
November 17, 2021
3:00-5:00 PM

Members in Attendance: Baber; Blackmond Larnell; Brown; Cornelius; Dahari; Dentato; Desai; Dong; Dunderdale; Elsky; Gawlinski; Gupta-Mukherjee; Haske; Holschen; Johnson; Jules; Kang; McGuigan; Moran; Nicholas; Ohsowski; O'Rourke; Pope; Rosenblatt; Shoenberger; Silva; Tangarife; Todd; Heer (ex-officio)

Guests: Megan Barry, Director of Community Service and Action; Provost Margaret Callahan; Anastasia Crosswhite from Spencer Stuart; Associate Professor Julian Diaz from the Quinlan School of Business; Rick Hammond, chair of Board of Trustees Governance Committee; Mark Hoppe, Vice Chair of Board of Trustees; ; Sam Marzo, Dean of Stritch School of Medicine; Sharon Okeefe, Board member and past President of the University of Chicago Medical School; Richie Salmi, S.J.; Susan Sher, Chair of Board of Trustees; Donald Snead from Spencer Stuart; George Trone, Liason to Board of Trustees;

I. Presidential Search Committee – Listening Session

Jules opens the meeting, acknowledges the presence of Chair of the Board of Trustees Susan Sher. Sher introduces herself, as a graduate of the law school in addition to the current Board chair. She commends attendance at this meeting and indicates that it shows how seriously the Faculty Council takes the responsibility of finding next president. Faculty input, she says, is very important in identifying attributes needed in next leader. She introduces other Presidential Search Committee members who have joined.

Sher yields the floor to Anastasia Crosswhite from Spencer Stuart, the firm hired to help with the search. Crosswhite describes the process, which still in its early stages. First is the development of a leadership profile. Once that is developed, the committee will start talking to potential candidates. It welcomes nominations from us and other members of the LUC community. She asks for questions about process.

Jules resumes moderation. He indicates that we were given four questions, and that the Executive Committee pulled together responses to a survey circulated to all Council members.

The first is what makes LUC distinctive. The chair of the Academic Affairs Committee stresses the commitment to Jesuit values – we are not just about vocational training, or even academic excellence more broadly construed. The commitment to Jesuit values appears in our mission not only to achieve academic excellence but also to instill a strong sense of service and social justice in our students. In terms of our teaching, transformative education and *cura personalis* truly set our university apart. A Loyola education equips students to think about ends as well as means; it equips them

to serve society and the vulnerable as well as their own careers. In the College of Arts and Sciences we have a rigorous Core (which includes required courses in philosophy and theology) and we offer an integrative and well-developed liberal arts education. This prepares undergraduates and graduate students for a mission-centric career. Our approach to education stands in strong contrast to a narrower vocational and applied nature that can be found at other institutions.

The Council, this member continues, would also like to address two other areas in which we see our mission at play. First, Loyola fosters social and economic diversity, not least in the foundation of Arrupe College. Second, our commitment to sustainability is a crucial element of our identity. In addition to our downtown campus and the Health Sciences campus, we have a gorgeous lakefront campus on the north side of Chicago that attracts students. But it is not merely beautiful. Our campus allows our students to understand the interface between the urban environment and nature and to address the intertwined social and environmental injustices present in Chicago and beyond.

Sher asks for copy of this statement, describing it as “powerful and helpful.” Jules asks if there are other thoughts about distinctiveness. A member thanks the Academic Affairs Chair for that summary. This member wants to add thoughts about role of university in civic society. Loyola has a commitment to the public good through research and learning (the latter of which also includes research). This member wants the committee to keep in mind particular contributions to civic society as well as what distinguishes Loyola from other universities. Another member highlights the role of integration with Rogers Park community – something distinct and influential about LUC. An additional member refers to and pastes in a link to an editorial on Chicago perception of LUC. They argue that we straddle the roles of liberal arts undergraduate institution and a research university.

<https://www.chicagotribune.com/opinion/editorials/ct-edit-loyola-university-chicago-ramblers-20180328-story.html>

Jules poses a second question about the challenges that Loyola faces. A member summarizes the Council’s stance on this question. The first key challenge centers on financial operations. Advancement and development initiatives at the university level and across academic units have been dismal at best and key opportunities have been missed for years now. Additionally, revamping our grants management office and ORS would also assist at the unit level with providing support for seeking and maintaining grants at the foundation, local, and federal levels. The second key challenge pertains to the university making an authentic long-term commitment to anti-racist practices as well as anti-oppressive practices from the administration down and across all academic units. This includes a commitment to hiring and retaining diverse FT faculty (Black, Hispanic/Latino, Transgender), and creating a campus climate that supports the retention of such diverse faculty which is no easy task for many universities. This also includes making LUC more affordable for first generation and minority students. We can create exams and hire more administrators that focus on diversity topics, but if we are not truly committed to making such changes, all these moves are frankly performative.

The third key challenge that this member points to pertains to making a commitment to robust health and mental health care for all university students, staff, and faculty, and not focusing solely on university cost savings (e.g., health and mental health care insurance plans, as well as vision, dental, and prescription coverage). This would also include the critical expansion of student services overlooked for years now (e.g., writing center, counseling center, student accommodations, etc.). The fourth key challenge is to ensure we hire and retain a president who comes from the field of academia. LUC needs a president who authentically understands, promotes, and sustains a commitment to shared governance and social justice. LUC needs a president who is committed to ensuring we are truly One Loyola in practice, and no longer simply in name.

Jules opens the floor to discussion of this question. One member points to our growth over last few years. This is good, but comes with issues, like space shortage, staff shortage, and research capacity. Another member notes that the discussion so far is about specific challenges facing Loyola; but we also face challenges similar to those of other universities. We are not in a healthy political situation, or environmental situation. The next President should be prepared for those systemic challenges; we need somebody who can promote and defend the public good that universities provide. Other members point to what they understand as the very poor reputation of Loyola on questions of racial justice and an equitable climate on campus.

Jules then raises the third question circulated in advance, about priorities that the next President should have. The member summarizing Council views points to five factors. We need fund-raising to increase the endowment. This is important for many functions of the University, including creating greater infrastructure and support for research. A second priority is boosting moral and loyalty in faculty and staff, inspiring them to invest their energy and talents to enhance Loyola. This includes instituting shared governance, bettering faculty retention, respecting academic freedom, relying less on part-time labor and hiring more tenured and tenure-track faculty. Third, we would like to see improving the administration itself made a priority. This includes diversifying the administrators, creating a culture of respect to faculty by all levels of administrations, setting up transparent and vigorous evaluation systems of administrators, designing a clear and specific path for the future of Loyola, stabilizing upper administration, and integrating different campuses.

Strengthening student education is another priority. This includes promoting the liberal arts and the humanities, advocating for social and environmental justice through service learning, as well as diversifying faculty, staff, and student populations. Finally, the importance of engaging in open and honest communications with the University community is stressed. This includes acknowledging the challenges ahead, as well as frequent dialogue with students and faculty.

Jules opens the floor on this question. A number of Council members point to the university's reputation on matters of racial justice within our community. Several observe that this impacts faculty searches in which they are involved. Anastasia Crosswhite asks for details about our damaged reputation. One Council member points out reluctance to engage on specific circumstances in this very conversation may

reflect part of the problem. Another member points to challenges in retention and recruitment of diverse faculty. The importance of Marcus Mason's departure from the Office of Admission, and his allegations of sustained racial harassment, and their coverage in the press, is discussed. Another member argues that we need a president who takes this question on directly her- or himself, rather than delegating it. A vision for an anti-racist Loyola has to be supported by practice, but also by intellectual rigor.

Jules raises the fourth question, that of the desired skill sets, experiences, and attributes of the next President. The Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee conveys the Council's views. We overwhelmingly feel that the next president should come from an academic background and specifically have had experience teaching in a university classroom. This person should understand and appreciate the value of a liberal arts education that values the humanities as well as a Jesuit education. This appreciation should be shown through a commitment to shared governance and an ability to listen and respond to concerns of faculty, students, and other groups on campus. As one member put it, "leadership is not just about making correct decisions at the top, but also about capitalizing on the talents and commitments of faculty, staff, and students." Faculty also strongly felt that the next president should have a record of dedication to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

In terms of skills and attributes, faculty expressed a desire for someone with strong communication skills, who is willing to convey the bases for decisions and has an ability to present a vision to the public for fundraising and advocacy for Loyola's mission. Council members expressed a desire for someone who could relate to issues faced by faculty and students, ideally demonstrated through prior administrative experience at an institution of higher learning.

Jules opens discussion of this point. He reemphasizes the question of the racial climate on campus. He has been here eleven years, only knows of four black full professors, two of whom have been hired as administrators. People have been retaliated against in numerous ways. He says that we work "in a low-trust environment" currently. Somebody coming in needs to recognize these crucial facts. We do not want to stay in past, but need to learn from it. Another member says that an incoming President should have questions about social justice and what it means.

Jules thanks the search committee members in attendance, who depart the meeting.

II. Debrief of Presidential Search Committee listening session

Jules opens the floor to discussion. One member says that they think the conversation was well-done. Another member asks Jules for his sense of internal discussions. Jules says that the committee has done a good job reaching out to constituencies. Committee members are starting to hear same messages repeated. In general, trustees are unaware of challenges faced by students, staff, and faculty members. He hopes they will realize this says something about board as well.

III. Chair's Report

Jules summarizes the recent meeting with the President and Provost. They have been working well together. He trusts that from January on, the university will be operating under its normal governance structures, with the emergency structure activated during the pandemic no longer operating. The Faculty Council and University Senate have asked for seats on the committees of this management system.

Jules raises the prospect of mandatory mid-semester grade entry. He reminds the Council of student complaints about having little feedback by the withdrawal deadline. Students want to know where they stand. He asks the Provost if he described this issue correctly. Callahan says yes, that it is really an issue about undergraduates. But it is also prominent point being made by parents. She expresses uncertainty about frequency of this problem. Obviously a decision about mandating the entry of mid-term grades would not be rushed. One member expresses uncertainty if it is a grading issue or an issue of when work is assigned. Callahan responds that it is all of those – some that students have not had assessments due, others have not received grades or substantive feedback. One member asks if the problem is more frequent with adjuncts. Who exactly is doing this? Callahan acknowledges that she does not know, but keeps hearing this as a problem. Jules says that he will send to academic affairs. Another member expresses concern that across the board mandates like having all faculty submit midterm grades for all students end up imposing a burden on everybody when the problem may lie with just a few.

Jules mentions a Council holiday event, scheduled for December 15, and a retreat, scheduled for January 14.

Jules then changes discussion to the Shared Governance Task Force. It has finally submitted its final report. It recommends thorough-going changes, but raise question of role of the Faculty Council versus the University Senate. Since faculty members involved in every step of a new program's development, where do we want to be added to the rainbow chart? It could be that the question of closing programs would come to the Council, but not approval of new programs. The Chair of the Senate says that Jules explained the issue well. She wants to reiterate that she agrees with his point of view.

The floor is opened for discussion. One member says maybe the question should be re-framed, not about "wants" and "rubber stamps." Jules stresses the informational aspects. There is a prospect of smaller and more nimble Senate. Currently there are 18 faculty on Senate, which both Senate and Council chairs agree is too many. Maybe some Council members would sit on Senate. One member argues that the principles of shared governance, which provide for faculty oversight of educational issues, apply here. Another member agrees. Several members observe that there academic councils in various schools do engage in extensive faculty oversight and discussion. The Provost points out that the staff also want to vet various proposals and initiatives. She further emphasizes that slowing down approval of new programs is not in the university's best interest. So some kind of middle ground would be helpful.

Jules observes that securing a revised handbook cannot proceed until these issues are resolved. We have to move this forward so handbook can get moving.

Extensive discussion of how to proceed ensues. TJ asks for Council approval to keep the Council on the “Rainbow Chart” for the following items:

- 34 Elimination of existing department and faculty
- 35 Creation of new school, college, or institute
- 36 Elimination of existing school or college
- 38 Reorganization of academic units across schools
- 42 New University Curriculum (i.e., Core)

The Council agrees to support him in that endeavor.

Jules then turns to the matter of the composition of the Presidential Search Committee. There is no faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences, which offers about half of credit hours at Loyola. Jules sympathizes with the concern; the Board chair will observe that the graduate student on the Committee is from CAS.

With respect to Dean evaluations, the picture is mixed. The results for the School of Environmental Sustainability have been released, but he is still in conversation about Quinlan. Jules is not sure if the matter can be resolved by end of semester, apologizes to business faculty. The Provost points to an agreement made between the past Provost and past Dean.

IV. Action Item: Aetna Resolution

Jules begins discussion by noting that we have a vacancy on the Benefits Advisory Committee which we will be seeking to fill. The President has acknowledged that the Committee has not been very effective. Council members should be encouraging their colleagues to fill out the survey on health insurance and coverage. He introduces the resolution, explaining that it is also being considered by University Senate and Staff Council. Resolution is moved and seconded. The Provost raises a friendly amendment, suggesting that it may not be advisable to endorse Blue Cross Blue Shield explicitly, so as to avoid putting the university in a weak bargaining position. Her amendment is accepted, worded as inserting “or another premium provider” in the text.

The Council member on the benefits advisory committee indicates that they will remind others of original survey when the Committee meets to consider new examples. A work-life survey is being added to this, which they had hoped to wait for. There is urgency in getting info by January. Any changes made quickly in spring would be for following year. Another member indicates their belief that we should pass this now, because it highlights real problems. The question is called and seconded, and the resolution passes unanimously with one abstention, as follows:

Whereas the survey of Loyola University Chicago faculty (which compared coverage, costs, and health outcomes arising from the change of health care service administrative management from Blue Cross Blue Shield to Aetna) indicated significant difficulties in maintaining continuity of care and coordination of health care services, as well as displeasure, frustration, aggravation, and disrupted and untimely health care resulting from the lack of covered services, poor customer service responses, and rejection of claims by Aetna;

Whereas the figure provided in 2019 for university financial savings with this change was from \$1M to \$1.5M dollars, in the context of a nearly \$600 million dollar annual budget;

Whereas the recent survey of Loyola University Chicago faculty revealed Aetna's practices of reluctance to approve healthcare provider services, minimal in-network mental health care services, poor pharmaceutical coverage, and rates of approval and combative and/or delayed claims practices that have collectively resulted in significant added financial and health hardships for Loyola faculty, staff members, and their families;

Whereas a recent email communication dated October 4, 2021 from Loyola University Hospital to its patients and staff indicates that LUMC may no longer be an in-network provider with Aetna if contract negotiations are not successful by year end, which essentially would eliminate our own namesake hospital affiliated with our Loyola Stritch School of Medicine from being a site for our faculty and staff to obtain in network cost effective health care services;

Whereas a recent statement from a Human Resources Update dates October 14, 2021 stated that supplemental behavioral health resources would be added in 2022 through the EAP as a result of inadequate coverage and care for mental health services from Aetna, after such services have been lacking for the past two years in the midst of a global health pandemic;

Whereas a recent statement from a Human Resources Update dated October 26, 2021 from Winifred Williams indicated "We remain confident in our partnership with Aetna as the University's health insurance partner" seems to blatantly ignore the established net impact of the change in health insurance providers;

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Council, Staff Council, and University Senate of Loyola University Chicago urge that negotiations commence to return health insurance provider coverage to Blue Cross Blue Shield or another premium provider.

The meeting adjourns.