School of Education
Academic Council Special Meeting
March 20 2018, 1-3 pm
Lewis Towers 410

1. Call to order
2. Introductions: Voting AC members, ex-officio members and SOE community members in attendance
   a. Voting AC members: Yver Melchor, Samantha Etzkorn, Brad MacDonald, Mike Boyle, Sue Graham, Blanca Torres-Olave (proxy for Demetri Morgan), Eunju Yoon, Adam Kennedy, Kate Phillippo, Wendy Threadgill, Lynne Golomb, Meng-Jia Wu
   b. Ex-officio: Siobhan Cafferty, David Slavsky
   c. Non voting participants: Eilene Edzej, Noah Sobe, Sara Cohen, Seungho Moon, Tavis Jules, David Schriberg
3. Review of meeting’s purpose, procedures to be followed for discussion, vote, change to written bylaws
   a. Kate reviewed the purpose of meeting to make decisions with full community input. Procedural norms reviewed.
4. Continuation of committees (review in order listed in bylaws)
   a. Article 4-Committees
      i. Article 4f. Eileen proposed to explore possibility of pulling the assessment committee from charge of Academic Council. In effort to not duplicate work, Eileen proposed to embed assessment committee into leadership council.
      ii. Meng-Jia also serves on assessment committee and says survey of alumni is part of this committee’s work.
      iii. David Slavsky also mentioned academic program review must be considered. Higher learning commission suggests all areas start doing this. We need to put together framework for university-wide program review. We will need to add survey and status of alumni (it is quite impressive). Professional schools already do this. SOE relies on Facebook and LinkedIn. The university recognizes that it’s important work and it will be incorporated. Each program will soon be supplied with framework and asked to do this.
      iv. Kate asked if that would be the assessment committee’s responsibility. Sue asked what an assessment committee does, response provided according to bylaws.
      v. Motion: Sue made motion to dissolve assessment committee.
      vi. Vote: 10 voted in favor, 1 abstention (Eunju)
g. International committee
   i. Wendy asked for an update on this committee. Blanca agreed and said she hasn’t seen much action.
   ii. Sara is the chair this year. She mentioned that all members of the committee were new this year, which led to a slow start. They did not find much information from past years. They are currently working on SOE website, from the perspective of international undergrad/grad students. They also had a guest speaker who presented statistics of increased representation of international students in SOE and Loyola as a whole. Their goal is to increase their visibility and provide clarity of purpose. Blanca echoed the thought that there should be a structure for continuity in the group. Yver also echoed the idea of the importance of this committee. Noah reported observations that it seems disconnected with purpose and the rest of SOE. He’s not sure why it should be part of AC. He proposed it should be removed from AC and should be part of Leadership Council, as it should be deeply connected with programs, recruitment. He insisted it should not be part of our governing structure of AC. Wendy seconded that sentiment. Yver asked about more international classes – would Leadership Council be able to weigh in on this? Academic Council has student representation; LC does not. Sara shared that it’s important to have students (international and American) on it. Noah agreed with the importance of students, but clarified that International Council would report to Leadership Committee. Linnie questioned the reason for the move. Blanca mentioned that we should raise the profile of the IC because it impacts students directly. It’s more effective to internationalize the curriculum across the board. Would moving it to LC help it get that traction and cause changes to curriculum? Sue reminded AC that we are only on the part of the agenda to decide if we should continue the committee. We should wait to decide when we get to that portion of the agenda.

h. Student development committee – no comment

i. Technology committee
   i. Seungho wanted clarification of tech committee’s purpose for SOE and how it differed from tech committee for university. He explained they have faculty members and are looking for student members. Their purpose is to develop ways to improve technology. Do we want to keep the bylaw that the SOE tech chair will be the chair for the university committee?
   ii. Noah does not see a need for a tech committee. Do we want a permanent standing committee working on it? We can still act on this, but don’t necessarily need a standing committee.
   iii. Wendy has been on the tech committee. It’s a struggle to figure out what to do. It’s one of those committees that you get “thrown on” and agrees that it is not needed.
iv. David Slavski said it might be a good time to illustrate the differences between AC and LC. Curricular needs that require technology belong with AC. LC-primary goals are strategic planning for the future, so we might consider what is the status of current technology? Tech needs? LC can take up strategic questions, what are things that are lacking? Broken? AC should not need to worry about this. They should be thinking of more broad items like curriculum or shared governance.

v. Sue agreed that Tech committee can be eliminated.

vi. Sam added that from a student perspective, we are confronted with technology that we don’t have training in. Lack of knowledge does not give Loyola grads an edge. There is continued conversation among students about tech needs. (ex: smartboard technology). She asks that AC makes sure that it’s still a topic of conversation.

vii. Brad’s teacher uses a mini-projector in a school where there is no projector. When he was on tech committee, he doesn’t remember meeting. It doesn’t need to exist but tech is important.

viii. Noah agrees that tech is important for T&L program and they need to incorporate it into their curriculum.

ix. Seungho asked if there are other ways to address tech concerns of students if tech committee is eliminated.

x. **Motion:** Sue motioned to dissolve tech committee.

xi. Brad seconded. 11 yes, no opposed, no abstention.

xii. David mentioned that smartboard changed the terms of their agreement, and it’s a more complex issue to be a client. Now it’s a provost or higher who makes the decision about contracts, not the dean.

xiii. Sam reiterated that there is a knowledge gap among students with smartboard usage.

xiv. Siobhan asked about blended and online courses.

xv. Kate wondered if anyone would have a recommendation for leadership council.

xvi. **Motion:** Sam motioned that the SOE should ask LC to look into providing effective training.

xvii. 12 in favor, no oppositions, no abstentions

5. Continuation of committees as standing committees of Academic Council (or possible revision of committee structure to report to Leadership Council)

   a. 8 standing committees
      i. Curriculum
      ii. Diversity
      iii. Awards
      iv. Faculty Development and Mentoring
      v. Faculty Evaluation
      vi. Grievance
      vii. International

      1. Blanca suggested having an “internationalization” committee, so perhaps having a more strategic focus makes sense.
2. Yver asks where complaints from international students would go.
3. Blanca mentioned that the SOE needs to make special efforts to make this environment welcoming but also integrating international perspectives, with concrete aims in mind.
4. Dave asked the difference of international committee vs. diversity committee? Diversity committee is a broader net and it seems like there is some overlap between the two, and the same argument can apply there.
5. Wendy seconded that thought.
6. Sara mentioned that Yver’s comments were great and caused her to think about how to address them.
7. Sue thought that if international should be LC, then diversity should be as well.
8. Noah commented that Diversity committee represents an area where faculty and students should come together within AC. Track record shows it does some great work and international committee maybe should be “internationalization” committee.
9. Wendy has some concerns about diversity committee because committee members are sometimes charged with doing things that are not comfortable, which can be problematic. It should be taken more seriously.
10. Mike: we need to look at the purposes/missions of these committees, because it’s been awhile since they started and maybe the aims have changed.
11. Siobhan: It’s difficult to make these plans because the strategic plan is not in place and goals are not clear and direct. I don’t understand why we would want to move them when we don’t have the map in front of us of where we are going.
12. Linnie: Should we be making these changes without thinking them through?
13. Blanca: Needs to be strategic thinking around diversity. Cautions that diversity and international are distinct. Could water down both groups if we group them together.
14. Sue: Why are we deciding what LC should get?
15. Noah: LC would welcome assessment committee.
16. Mike: Want to honor the process so that LC does not make the decision for the other group.
17. Dave: Without an assigned dean, AC should have representation about important topics.
18. Karen: there should be representation on both but maybe different focus areas for both councils
19. Noah: Please don’t create duplicate committees. The goal is to reduce the number of committees.
20. Sue: Has LC decided what committees they want to be in charge of?
21. Kate: Clarified the communication about committee work.
22. Sue: If you’re responding back to LC, we are wondering what LC would do with International Committee and Diversity Committee before we give it to them.
23. David: 2 issues. Number of standing committees sometimes exceeds number of faculty in each program. Every program must be represented on each committee. Faculty members are serving on every committee. Can we reduce the load of committees? Let’s also look at our operations and ask if there is another way we should be doing them. There is not clarification on what LC does. Can we re-envision/reimagine what we do?
25. Kate: Does International Committee remain standing committee of AC or put it on LC?
26. Wendy: How can we vote if we don’t know what its purpose is?
27. Adam: There is also the concern about student representation on the committee if it moves to the LC.
28. Blanca: Last year, International Committee can say “we will do this” but we can’t do it unless we have backing. It’s has to be a conversation with someone else.
29. **Motion:** Sue - Ask LC to describe what International Committee and Diversity Committee would look like under their leadership so we have a full understanding of each committee’s purpose.
30. In favor: 12, no opposition, no abstention

viii. Student Development Committee

6. Composition of committees (Article 3D)
   a. Currently representative and appointed by unit/program area
      i. Awards
         1. Dave S. thought it odd that Awards has representation but Faculty Evaluation does not. He does not see the need for every area to be represented for Awards.
         2. Eilene: Should be representation by types of employees (staff, faculty, etc.)
         3. Dave: Committee should be diverse (not represented by one affinity group who ultimately gets the award).
         4. Noah: Agrees that awards should be changed and that it should be more diverse. Suggested stipulation: no more than 2 per area.
         5. Sue: Asked about adding those who previously won the award. Suggestion would be 6 people on committee. Reduce current number by 1 per group.
         6. Brad: As a student, it’s hard to relate to the awards. Students are “unaware” or do not know enough about the nominees.
Student perspective is difficult since they haven’t met the nominees in person sometimes.

7. Kate: Raised concern about more/less student input.
8. Blanca: Suggested 2 faculty members. She has fewer concerns about giving awards to those in the same content area.
9. **Motion:** Sue made a motion to ask Awards Committee to develop composition of membership that they would like to see. Wendy seconded it.
10. 12 in favor, no opposition, no abstention.

   ii. Curriculum
   1. Retain its representation

   iii. Student Development
   1. Retain its representation

b. Currently elected by SOE full time faculty vote, not representative of all units/program areas

   i. Diversity
   1. Sue: Thought Chair can be a faculty member
   2. Eunju: Some staff feel unsafe about chairing committees
   3. Lynne: She has been asked as a non-tenured faculty to chair committees
   4. Brad: We talk a lot about access, power in AC, it shouldn’t be a barrier if you have tenure or not
   5. Blanca: It would be ideal to think it should not be a barrier, but it is. We saw it happen last year. We should have more clinical faculty in addition to the tenured faculty.
   6. Sara: Can we take both positions into account?
   7. Dave: Agreed with Blanca. Chair should be equal—not someone who makes the decisions. Tenured person is better equipped to handle issues that may arise as Chair than non-tenured faculty.
8. Kate: Reiterated role of Chair
9. Wendy: Agreed, because some people were penalized as Chair.
10. Sue commented that each person should be able to choose
11. Mike: Agreed with Sue that we should have choice, but non-tenured faculty don’t really have time to chair a committee
12. Kate: Saying you can’t isn’t the same as saying you don’t have to.
13. Dave: Everyone has equal value and statements should come from on behalf of the committee, not from the Chair personally.
14. Eileen: Concerned that there is a concern with being protected.
15. Kate: Brought up the difference between 1 year clinical and those on longer contract. What is fair for clinical faculty and terms for promotion? To chair a committee—is it one year? Multiple year? Maybe the issue is that there is no explicit term of Chair.
16. Lynne: There is a larger issue of tenured/non-tenured track chairs. We’ve made progress with clinical faculty committee.
17. Kate: Has not heard anyone who has said they don’t want the protection, tenured or non-tenured. Concern of being pressed into leadership role, which is different from concerns of job protection and job stability.
18. **Motion:** Sue-change sentence to full-time tenured or clinical faculty can chair Diversity Committee.
19. 9 in favor, 3 abstaining
20. **Motion:** Sue to adjourn meeting, Brad second

End of meeting

ii. Faculty Development and Mentoring
iii. Faculty Evaluation
iv. Grievance
v. International
vi. Technology

7. Procedure for replacement of elected committee members due to temporary leave, resignation from committee or resignation from SOE
8. Revisit order of voting (Article 4 D)
9. Adjournment