

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Draft Minutes for Meeting of Wednesday, March 24, 2010**  
**2:00-4:00 PM – TSC 303 & 304 (3<sup>rd</sup> floor study room of Baumhart Hall)**

Members present: J. Belmares, H. Boller, R. Bowen, H. Cannon, D. Castignetti, N. Derhammer, M. Dominiak, A. Fitch, C. Jurgensmeier, D. Kaplan, T. Kilbane, J. Kostolansky, N. Lash, J. Lieblich, H. Miller, E. Myers, G. Ramsey, H. Rose, B. Schmidt, P. Schraeder, D. Schweickart, A. Shoenberger, N. Sobe, S. Urban

Peter Schraeder called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

1. Invocation (Charles Jurgensmeier, S.J.)

2. Question-and-Answer Session with President Michael J. Garanzini, S.J.

Fr. Garanzini gave a brief presentation of teaching & faculty workloads. Comparison is done with peer groups of Jesuit and “like” universities. He handed out copies of his presentation, which outlined the key elements of the policy. The main concerns are student recruitment and retention rates, disparities throughout the university regarding class sizes and learning environments, rankings and course delivery. A question and answer period followed. The following answers by Fr. Garanzini are summarized.

Q: D. Schweickart: David expressed concerns about faculty morale. Data were not obtained before the policy statement was made across the university. What is our identity: teaching or research? Faculty composition is changing, so what is the true purpose? Something has changed in the culture at Loyola. There is a lack of communication regarding the purpose of the teaching load policy.

A: Undergraduates are key focus of the teaching policy. We want to build a basic community.

Q: G. Ramsey: The expectations for the faculty are unrealistic. The 3-2 load does not allow significant state-of-the-art scientific research, competitive with other similar institutions; undergraduate research will be stifled (no credit for fewer than 3.5 students per semester in CAS); grants (we are given no time compensation to administer grants for less than \$30k, so that a \$25k grant will likely not be credited); there is no accounting for time to perform service (which we are all doing in FC) that counts for 20% of our assessment. All of these policies in our college prevent the faculty from achieving some of the key goals of the strategic plan. This is contrary to efficient management practices. Presumably all negotiations are final. How do we solve this conundrum?

A: You are encouraged to hire more non-tenure track faculty to ease the load. Try to have further negotiations on loads (define “load”). Full time faculty are important to the success of the students! Some science departments have much lower loads, so try to define contact hour loads or equivalent.

Q: S. Urban: NTT faculty have higher loads than tenured faculty, but some the loads are not evenly distributed.

A: This is expected.

Q: R. Bowen: Class sizes – we should get data on the numbers of class sizes versus number of classes taught.

A: Delivery methods are important – we should negotiate class sizes versus course load.

Q: D. Kaplan: The problem with shared governance is of concern (in the English department) with the teaching load policy being across the board. Full time faculty with higher teaching loads will not necessarily lead to quality teaching. There is a two-tiered system of faculty loads with respect to those active in research.

A: Now, 30% of full time faculty teach less than a 2-2 load. We cannot afford too many faculty with teaching this load. We should reward teaching in other ways, like salary. We still have to address the higher education crisis. The departments should be accountable for professor time. Ensure that the students are getting their investment's worth to be able to attract the best.

Q: H. Miller: There appears to be an inequity of teaching loads and research productivity. There is a bias on departments and faculty within departments. Will the administration consider a leave policy? We need more leaves to compensate for higher teaching loads.

A: Raise these issues with the Dean. The Deans should issue standards. No leaves have been factored in but we still have a teaching load deficit. There will be no commitment for leaves when we have this deficit. The product delivered to students is most important!

Q: T. Kilbane: Increases in teaching loads will continue for less research active but research active loads are inconsistent in overall loads. Some research active faculty are teaching more than others, with many things not counting. Graduate student issues are different. There is no accounting for different styles of teaching for certain professions.

A: Negotiate this with the Dean. The other loads have gone down for professional schools. Large loads for research active are uncommon.

We will gather questions and compile a list of them to send to FC. We will have discussion of these issues at the next meeting. Finally we will forward these questions to Fr. Garanzini to address after our discussion. Think about what we want to deliver with respect to UG teaching and research.

D. Schweickart and H. Miller sent Fr. Garanzini a set of questions privately and will forward responses to the Faculty Council.

3. Approval of February Minutes (see attachment) – Passed unanimously.

4. Chair's report:

- Peter gave an update on the progress of recovery for Gerry McDonald.
- Gender equity committee report was edited and sent to Fr. Garanzini who will forward it to human resources. Thanks to Linda Heath for her work on this.
- Faculty appeals committee: one grievance was received by the appeals committee. Fr. Garanzini will choose 3 persons from the list of 8 provided by FC and he will add 2 more from his list to comprise the committee. This totals 5 people with 2

alternates. P. Schraeder will send 8 names from the FC to Fr. Garanzini for this appeal to serve as a standing committee.

- P. Schraeder e-mailed Donna at the medical center for updates on Dr. Whelton's medical center periodic message updates.

5. Provost Search Update – The Provost Search Committee will focus on numerous qualities, including a candidate's commitment to shared governance and relations with faculty (other issues: leadership, vision, working with students, diversity, fundraising, scholarship). Faculty and students will be afforded sessions with each of the candidates. Town hall meetings are scheduled. All candidates will have lunch with some FC members (10-13) and all will have town hall meetings. One candidate dropped out. M. Dominiak pointed out that the Loyola Phoenix stated that J. Pelissero is an internal candidate (which was not divulged by FC).

6. Benefit's Advisory Group, consisting of Walter Jay, Allen Schoenberger and Linda Heath, is proposing an increase to the university's contribution toward TIAA/CREF to 10%. The committee will propose that individual faculty contributions are necessary for the university to contribute the 10%. Meetings are scheduled to decide on a plan. A total retirement contribution of 15% of salary is recommended by the experts. The Loyola Benefit plan for faculty will be modified. The Faculty Council requests that no faculty have less than 8% university contribution in negotiations, even if they do not contribute individually. The goal of the committee is to have a plan completed by May.

6. FC elections committee: (David Schweickert and Terry Kilbane) Nominations have been made. Humanities and Law School have equal numbers of candidates and slots, so no vote is necessary. There are no Natural Science faculty willing to fill one open slot. T. Kilbane will make some calls. Final ballots will go out soon. There was a proposal to nominate all existing officers (President, Vice President and Secretary to stay on. However, P. Schraeder will be stepping down. M. Dominiak and G. Ramsey were nominated for Chair by W. Jay – they will consider the nomination. An open question was raised if we wish to rotate Chairs annually. The elections will be held at the April meeting.

7. Course evaluations: T Kilbane (online) – There is an appearance that overall ratings have decreased with response rate. This effects overall faculty evaluations. Can we build in mandatory evaluations? A poll was taken on methods used for teaching evaluations: Paper evaluations: School of Education, English, Psychology, Chemistry, Philosophy, Biology and the School of Communications use both paper and electronic forms. Electronic forms: all other departments and schools. We wish to compare response rates and corresponding scores. We can get electronic rates from Jack Corliss. Give these to the Executive Committee and get figures from J. Pelissero for the meeting in April.

7. Adjournment (4:00 pm); Moved: Jorgensen, second: Miller. Unanimously approved.