Meeting called to order at 1:05 p.m.

Present: Kate Phillippo (chair) Brad McDonalad, Yver Melchor, Lynne Golomb, Adam Kennedy, Meng-Jia Wu, Eunju Yoon, Wendy Threadgill, Siobhan Cafferty, David Slavsky, Eilene Edejer, Noah Sobe, Darrien Pierre (representing Higher Ed) (voting members in Bold)

Proxy: Brad for Sam and Karen, Wendy for Sue, Lynne for Mike

1. Approval of minutes from February 2018

Wendy moved to approve minutes.
Meng-Ji second motion
Motion carried

2. Consent Agenda:
   a. Curriculum Committee

      ADSU
      New course for an Instructional Leadership Certificate: Instructional Leadership Coaching
      Instructional Leadership Certificate Program
      RMTD 530
      School Psych program changes:
      Combining CIEP 519 and 477 into a single course
      Replacement of CIEP 466 with RMTD 400 and 404 for online Ed.D.

      Adam moved to approve items on consent agenda
      Lynne second
      Motion carried unanimously

   b. Changes to Bylaws, Article 2A (Document with AC approved changes posted to Sakai)

      Meng-Jia moved to approve the changes in the ByLaws
      Wendy Second motion
      Motion carried unanimously

3. Reports
   Standing Committee: Reports as posted

   Report from Administration-(David Slavsky)
   
   The leadership council has completed the job description for program chairs which will be finalized and posted.
   Provost has approved several job searches:
Higher Ed has been approved to hire a tenure track faculty at the associate level. Bridget Kelly has been appointed chair of search committee for fall. School Psychology has been approved for a three year clinical track position to replace a retiring faculty. Markeda Newell has been appointed search chair and the search will begin immediately. Several faculty who have been on one year contracts have received three year contracts. Leadership is working to systematize what happens at the Rome Center. Search Committee has been formed to find a new director of the Rome Center. Position open to all full time faculty. Application will be ready soon. Search committee includes: Noah, Liz, Janis Fine.

CAEP is complete for now.

Report from Staff: (Wendy)
Nothing to date

Report from student:
Yver spoke about the work of GSAC. GSAC is developing a statement in support of international students. He read a draft of statement but will post the finalized statement, which should be completed by Friday. Brad stated that students are completing plans for the Research symposium on April 19.

Report from Chair:
Kate will send out an email to community detailing all the information from the AC meeting yesterday, March 20, 2018. She is hoping to solidify the makeup of committees prior to the voting at the April meeting. Awards committee, is meeting on Friday and they will provide Kate information regarding composition of their committee. This information will be sent to AC who are being asked to complete a ballot online so the information can be integrated into ballots for the election. Eunju will prepare a google doc for election. Although she offered to share this information with David, by-laws of AC allow these decisions to be made by AC. Any other changes to committees will need to be deferred until after elections since all decisions of committee longevity and membership were not made at the March 20 meeting.

4. Old business:

FEC procedures (Noah and Darren)
FEC committee has provided a comprehensive document to AC to describe a change of process for FEC. This will include a new cover sheet which allows the faculty member to utilize information necessary for FEC in an easily accessible document. It provides the committee a narrative from the faculty summarizing their work during the year and a self rating. A similar cover sheet is used widely in CAS. This information is consistent with P and T document. FEC will provide instructions and explicit information for completion. It gives the faculty a role in shaping FEC evaluation. It is the first document in the process. Then the FEC completes their review and completes their report. All documents then go to the dean. The dean meets with faculty and the faculty member has an additional opportunity to respond to the evaluation.
As part of this discussion, David added, that the University contract with Campus Labs (IDEA) is ending in August and the University is putting in place a committee to look at other systems. After a survey of other Jesuit and competitive universities it was determined that many have a home grown system. Loyola will consider this but it may take 2 years. The University will need something in place during this period. A paper system is not doable. The other concern about IDEA is the low response and how it is not possible to use these metrics to make any real decisions due to the low response rate. A discussion about how to increase responses included Yver saying that students might appreciate having these results published, Brad stated students may not understand that these responses affect faculty evaluations and it might be important to communicate that to students. The overall conclusion from this discussion is that because of issues of privacy these results cannot be shared.

Kate, in her role of chair, asked for a motion to address the request from FEC. Adam asked a question about the usefulness of this process and Noah stated it would be helpful when there is a mismatch between faculty self evaluation and FEC. They then could look deeper into the reasons why this might be happening. Was the document in FAS not completed in a manner which really reflected the caliber of work of the faculty etc. It is felt that it would be used as a part of a reflective process. Lynne added that this would be a positive step.

Motion:
AC accept the recommendation of FEC to use a cover sheet that includes the narrative and self-evaluation and FEC provide that template to the faculty.
Adam-second
Motion passed unanimously

Climate

Kate posted an email from a community member posing some questions about the issues around the no confidence vote and how she does not understand how that has effected climate. The discussion addressed the issues of confidentiality and privacy around these issues and how some of this information are issues which are not allowed, legally, to be discussed. Kate, as chair, can not answer this question since the vote was not called by AC. Additionally there are no bylaws or other guidance about no confidence votes so the process that was used is not predetermined. Wendy stated that people continue to ask about the action and why people were excluded and not asked to make that decision on their own. The question was raised, Is it an issue of the process or the outcome. However, it appears that the committee does not think that, in general, it is useful to revisit the past. The issue is to make sure that people feel they are being heard and valued. The dean’s office is willing to have discussions with people, but members feel it is not an issue for AC to adjudicate. David spoke about the movement to give a larger voice to clinical faculty as a positive step to the community hearing that need. He believes that the school has learned from this and is moving forward. Meng-Jia believes that perhaps finding a space for people to discuss might be
useful for those people. Wendy wondered if a verbal acknowledgment by those who made decisions about this might help in the healing. However, again, it is not an AC issue. AC issue is to try and find ways to address climate going forward. Kate will respond to community member email indicating Dean’s Office and AC Chair’s willingness to talk further about concerns.

Review of AC Bylaws: Articles 2 (Membership, continued) and 3 left off at By-Laws for AC
Currently the AC chair and faculty member at large end their terms at same time. We are increasing the faculty member at large to 3. Kate raised concern about at large and chair positions ending at the same time. To accomplish this we might consider an increase or decrease in the term of one or two members for this one time.

Lynne motioned that this year 2 of the members at large (1 of the clinical faculty) will sit for a 2 year term. 1 member will sit for a 1 year term in order that the AC chair and members at large terms do not end simultaneously.

Additionally a question about who can serve as chair was asked.

Wendy motioned that this be tabled at this time due to current deliberation about changes in roles and promotion criteria for clinical faculty in the SOE.

Adam seconded this motion

Unanimously passed

Adjunct Faculty:
Kate had asked Siobhan to provide information regarding onboarding of adjunct faculty. Siobhan provided a complete list of activities by the Deans office and the Programs regarding this process. There is also a survey that will be going out to all adjunct faculty. She also reached out to 2 other departments to see what they have done. This material is attached to these minutes. Kate asked Siobhan to follow up at the next meeting. Darien thanked Siobhan for this useful information. Adam added that in T and L each area chair is responsible for recruiting and onboarding their adjunct faculty. This information is attached at the end.

Clinical Faculty promotion Task Force (Eilene)
All clinical faculty have been engaged in developing this task force. Eilene, Michele and Jim were voted to be representatives with Pam and Siobhan being appointed as part of this committee. The committee will be reviewing information from other departments such as Business and CAS around these issues. David and Noah stated that the CAS document is very complete and may be useful as a template. The clinical faculty will meet together prior to next community meeting to work on the issues of promotion and evaluation. Although the original charge for this task force was to look at promotion, there is a great deal of overlap with evaluation since that is a large part of the criteria for promotion. There is overlap with the FEC work on who should be evaluating faculty with nontraditional roles. The clinical faculty task
force will try and develop a road map where they can delineate where their work fits into this larger structure.

5. New Business
Lynne asked that AC consider reviewing a revised program from Ad Su that needs to be reviewed by the state prior to the next AC meeting. She will send this material in the next day to Kate for review.

Motion for adjournment
Wendy motioned that meeting be adjourned
Adam second motion
Motion carried.